

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in the application.

The Examiner objected to the drawings, indicating the view that FIGs. 1-5 should be designated as “prior art.” FIGs. 1-3 have been amended accordingly. However, Applicants disagree with the Examiner regarding the characterization of FIGs. 4A, 4B and 5 as being admitted arts. In the specification as filed, FIGs. 4A and 4B are each noted as relating to “an embodiment of the present invention.” (Page 6, lines 8-11). Applicants acknowledge that drawings FIGs. 4A and 4B correspond to FIGs. 4 and 4B, respectively, of US Patent 6,601,106, which was incorporated by reference in the instant application at page 4, lines 12-19.

Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 12-17, 19-22, 25-27, 30-35, 37 and 38 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,697,872 (Moberg). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner indicated the view that Moberg discloses providing operations indications and expectation indications, with reference to Fig. 6, col. 8, lines 27-40 for support. The section cited by the Examiner relates to identification of which operation is to be performed by functional elements. This does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1 regarding operations indications and expectation indications. To further clarify these limitations, claim 1 has been amended to recite “providing operations indications of conditions which the element ensures upon completion of its operations” and “providing expectations indications of conditions the element expects to have been satisfied before it is called to process a packet.”

Support for the amendment is found at least at page 13, lines 6-10 and at page 14, lines 11-15.

Claim 1 further requires that in building the chain by combining elements, “the operations indications of the first element satisfy the expectations indications of the second element.” The sections of Moberg (col. 6, lines 43-50 and col. 8, lines 31-33) cited by the Examiner fail to teach this limitation. Therefore, Moberg does not anticipate claim 1.

Base claims 19, 37 and 38 have been amended in a similar manner. The rejected claims 2-4, 7-9, 12-17, 20-22, 25-27, 30-35 depend from the corresponding amended base claims, and should be allowable. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 6, 10, 11, 18, 23, 24, 28, 29 and 36 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In view of the remarks above in relation to the rejection of the base claims, Applicants have not rewritten the allowable dependent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

An Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) was filed on February 22, 2005. Entry of the IDS is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By


Timothy J. Meagher

Registration No. 39,302

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 


Amendments to the Drawings

FIGs. 1-3 are being amended to add the designation —Prior Art—.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Marked-Up Drawings



Docket/Appl'n No.: 2386.2013-000
Title: Dynamically Building Encapsulation ...
Inventors: Pradeep K. Kathail, et al.
Annotated Sheet



Prior Art
FIG. 1




FIG. 2
 PRIOR ART




FIG. 3
PRIOR ART